

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

EUGENE BRIAN GARVIE,

CASE NO. C24-1017 BHS

Petitioner,

ORDER

V.

JASON BENNETT,

Respondent.

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Grady J. Leupold's

Report and Recommendation (R&R), recommending the Court deny pro se petitioner Eugene Brian Garvie's second or successive 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition, deny a Certificate of Appealability, and dismiss the case without prejudice. Dkt. 9.

The R&R was originally noted for August 1, 2024. Dkt. 9 at 1. On July 26, Garvie filed a request for a copy of the R&R, asserting that “on 7/19/2024, the ‘Electronic Copy Filed’ electronically (ECF) receipt was served, but not the Magistrate’s Report and Recommendation.” Dkt. 10 at 1 (boldface omitted). That same day, the Clerk’s office sent Garvie a copy of the R&R, and the Court renoted the R&R to August 9, 2024, to

1 provide Garvie 14 additional days to object. Dkts. 10, 11. Garvie has not filed any
2 objections to the R&R.

3 A district judge must determine de novo any part of a magistrate judge's proposed
4 disposition *to which a party has properly objected*. It must modify or set aside any
5 portion of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The
6 district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further
7 evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. Fed. R. Civ. P.
8 72(b)(3). A proper objection requires "specific written objections to the proposed
9 findings and recommendations" in the R&R. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2).

10 Garvie's habeas petition is his fourth such filing, and this Court does not have
11 subject matter jurisdiction over it:

12 Before a petitioner is allowed to file a second or successive petition, he
13 must obtain an order from the Court of Appeals authorizing the district
court to consider the petition. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3); Rule 9 of the Habeas
14 Rules; Ninth Circuit Rule 22-3; *see also Woods v. Carey*, 525 F.3d 886,
888 (9th Cir. 2008). In the absence of such an order authorizing review, a
district court lacks jurisdiction to consider a second or successive petition.
See Magwood, 561 U.S. at 331; *Burton v. Stewart*, 549 U.S. 147, 157
(2007).

16 Dkt. 9 at 5.

17 The R&R is **ADOPTED**. The petition is **DENIED**, the Court will not issue a
18 Certificate of Appealability, and the case is **DISMISSED without prejudice**.

19 The Clerk shall enter a **JUDGMENT** and close the case.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 //

1 Dated this 9th day of August, 2024.

2
3
4



5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
United States District Judge